

REMARKS

In the above referenced case, claims 125-128 are pending. Applicant will sequentially address the issues raised by the Examiner.

I. Claim Objections

Claim 127 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 125-128 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly including new matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Although the Figures do not explicitly illustrate a specific projector having all the elements of independent claims 125 or 127, the combination of the elements in each of claims 125 and 127 is inherent in view of the Specification and figures as a whole.

Figure 8C illustrates an exemplary projector having equal light pathways from the source light to the LCDs and equal light pathways from the LCDs to the projection lens. See Specification, page 55. Figure 8D illustrates an exemplary projector that directly combines LCD altered beams without previously sub-combining the beams. The Specification describes both Figures 8C and 8D as operating and functioning exactly the same as Figure 8. See Specification, page 82, second paragraph, to page 83, first paragraph. In addition, the Specification describes both Figures 8C and 8D as being usable as a second modulation subsystem for creating the 3-D projector as illustrated in Figures 20, 20A & 20B. Id. Thus, the components of Figures 8C and 8D are inherently interchangeable.

One of the differences between Figures 8C and 8D is the use of multiple dichroic mirrors 90 & 92 (Figure 8C) versus the use of a single dichroic combiner 93 (Figure 8D) for combining beams altered by the LCDs (138, 140, & 142). The Specification specifically stated that the dichroic mirrors 90 & 92 can be replaced by the dichroic combiner 93. See Specification, page 85, second paragraph.

Based on all the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification and figures inherently disclose all the elements of independent claims 125 and 127 and no new matter has been added. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

III. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 125-128 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurematsu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,153,752 (“KUREMATSU”) in view of Konno, U.S. Patent No. 4,497,015 (“KONNO”).

The Examiner relied on KONNO for rejecting certain limitations in element [a] of independent claims 125 and 127 and relied on Figure 2 of KUREMATSU for all other elements.

A. Claim 125

Independent claim 125 recites at least the following elements:

- [d] [i] forming a first light path from the illumination subsystem to the altering means in which the first light path is equal for all altering means; and
- [ii] forming a second light path from each of the altering means to the projection subsystem in which the second light path is equal for all altering means.

As will be shown below, Applicant respectfully submits that KUREMATSU fails to disclose at least elements [d][i] and [d][ii] of claim 125. Thus, claim 125 is not unpatentable over KUREMATSU and KONNO.

1. KUREMATSU Does Not Disclose or Suggest Step [d][i]

Element [d][i] of claim 125 recites forming a first light path from the illumination subsystem to the altering means in which the first light path is equal for all altering means.

Figure 2 of KUREMATSU discloses a projector in which the first light paths from the illumination subsystem (20) to the altering means (LCDs 25R, 25G, 25B) are unequal for all altering means. The source light is separated by the cross dichroic prism (24) before entering the liquid crystal panels (25R, 25G, 25B). KUREMATSU, col. 6, lines 42-44. As a result of passing through the cross dichroic prism (24), at least some of the light entering the green liquid crystal panel 25G has a longer light path than some of the light entering the red or blue liquid crystal panels (25R, 25B). See Figure 2 of KUREMATSU.

Therefore, KUREMATSU does not disclose or suggest at least element [d][i] of claim 125.

2. KUREMATSU Does Not Disclose or Suggest Step [d][ii]

Element [d][ii] of claim 125 recites forming a second light path from each of the altering means to the projection subsystem in which the second light path is equal for all altering means.

Figure 2 of KUREMATSU discloses a projector in which the second light paths from the altering means (LCDs 25R, 25G, 25B) to the projection subsystem (26) are unequal for all altering means. Altered light beams from the liquid crystal panels (25R, 25G, 25B) again pass through the cross dichroic prism (24), which combines the altered beams, before entering the projection lens system (26). KUREMATSU, col. 7, lines 27-42. As a result of passing through the cross dichroic prism (24), at least some of the light exiting the green liquid crystal panel 25G has a longer light path to the projection system (26) than some of the light exiting the red or blue liquid crystal panels (25R, 25B). See Figure 2 of KUREMATSU.

Therefore, KUREMATSU also does not disclose or suggest element [d][ii] of claim 125.

Based on all the foregoing, claim 125 is not unpatentable over KUREMATSU in view of KONNO and is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection and allow this claim.

B. Claim 126

Claim 126 is dependent upon claim 125 and therefore should also be in condition for allowance.

C. Claim 127

Independent claim 127 recites substantially the same limitations as claim 125 as discussed above in Section I.A. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to claim 125, claim 127 should also be in condition for allowance.

D. Claim 128

Claim 128 is dependent upon claim 127 and therefore should also be in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Roxana H. Yang
Registration No. 46,788

PATENTESQUE LAW GROUP, LLP
P.O. Box 400
Los Altos, CA 94023
(650) 948-0822